

REMARKS

The examiner's observations respecting the proper language and form for an abstract are noted and appreciated, as is the indication that a timely filed terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome the rejection of Claim 1 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over the same claim of United States patent 5,675,637. The abstract as now amended by replacement paragraph conforms to the cited guidelines. Attached as an appendix hereto is a terminal disclaimer disclaiming the terminal portion of commonly owned United States patent 5,675,637. Accordingly, the obviousness-type double patenting rejection is overcome.

Claim 1 in method format as now amended stipulates for, among other things, receiving a first information item and automatically sending said first information item to a first information source as a request for a second information item and to a second information source as a request for a third information item in parallel so that access to the second and third information items is not dependent upon return of one of the second and third information items in order to access the other of the second and third information items. No new matter has been entered (see, for

example, specification, page 24, lines 1-20).

Claim 1 had been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Miller (Patent # 5,506,984). This is inappropriate for independent Claim 1 as now amended for the following reasons.

The initiation of database access by mouse click or other intentional act and the sequential query and response implementing virtual data integration by MakeCallBack and CallBack routines of Miller does not disclose receiving a first information item and automatically sending said first information item to a first information source as a request for a second information item and to a second information source as a request for a third information item, as stipulated for by amended independent Claim 1, and, among other things, does not disclose sending said first information item to said first and said second information sources as requests for second and third information items in parallel in such a way that access to the second and third information items is not dependent upon return of one of the second and third information items in order to access the other of the second and third information items as stipulated for by amended independent Claim 1.

Since for each of these reasons Claim 1 is patentably distinct from Miller, Claim 1 is allowable over Miller and does

In re: Aleksander Szlam et al.
Filed: October 18, 2001
Serial No.: 09/982,514
Page 7

not need to be further discussed herein.

Reconsideration, re-examination and early allowance of the Claim 1 remaining in the case are accordingly respectfully requested.

The examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Daniel J. Bourque
Registration No. 35,457
Attorney for Applicant(s)

BOURQUE & ASSOCIATES, P.A.
835 Hanover Street, Suite 301
Manchester, New Hampshire 03104

Telephone: (603) 623-5111
Facsimile: (603) 624-1432

Date: 10-25-04